



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/462,493	01/21/2000	TOSHIYUKI MORII	P18963	5153
7590	11/24/2003		EXAMINER	
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN 1941 ROLAND CLARK PLACE RESTON, VA 20191			ARMSTRONG, ANGELA A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2654	
			DATE MAILED: 11/24/2003	16

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/462,493	MORII ET AL
	Examiner Angela A. Armstrong	Art Unit 2654

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 August 2003 .

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-3-6 and 8-20 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1, 3, 5-6 8, 10-20 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) 4 and 9 is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on August 19, 2003 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 3, 5-6, 8, and 10-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Minde et al (US Patent No. 5,991,717) in view of Ozawa (US Patent No. 5,963,896).
3. Regarding claims 1, 3-6, and 8-20, Minde teaches an adaptive codebook in which previously synthesized excitation signals are stored; at col. 2, line 64 and col. 3, lines 33-38

a stochastic codebook in which a plurality of excitation vectors are stored, said stochastic codebook having a first subcodebook in which excitation vectors composed of a small number of pulses are stored and a second subcodebook in which excitation vectors composed of a large number of pulses are stored; at col. 7, lines 3-12

obtaining a synthesized speech using excitation information acquired from said adaptive codebook and said stochastic codebook, using LPC obtained by performing LPC analysis on an input speech signal; at col. 2, line 65

obtaining gain information for said synthesized speech using a relation of said synthesized speech and said input speech signal; at col. 3, lines 6-25

transmitting said LPC, said excitation information and said gain information, as inherent in the speech coder.

Minde et al do not specifically teach executing a voice/unvoiced judgment or calculating the gain of the stochastic codebook to account for the difference in the number of pulses in the codebooks.

Refer to Ozawa (col. 14, line 47 continuing to col. 16, line 21; col. 19, lines 31-55) who teaches a hybrid switched multi-pulse/stochastic speech coding technique, which makes a voice/unvoiced judgment by comparing the frame average pitch gain with respective thresholds, implements an amplitude codebook for implementing the pulse amplitude quantization, and teaches it is possible to obtain positions of any number of pulses with gain variations and to switch codebook circuits or gain codebooks using mode data. Ozawa further teaches the positions of the amplitude pulses are retrieved with a different gain for each group of pulses less in number than the total number of pulses M. Ozawa teaches that implementation of this scheme

increases the accuracy of the excitation and improves the performance of the coder (col. 15, line 67 continuing to col. 16, line 3)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to modify the system of Minde et al to implement voice/unvoiced judgments and providing for gains to account for the differences in pulse in the codebook, as taught by Ozawa, for the purpose of improving unvoiced speech performance in low-rate coders.

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 4 and 9 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 3, 5-6, 8, and 10-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Angela A. Armstrong whose telephone number is 703-308-6258. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 7:30-5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richemond Dorvil can be reached on (703) 305-9645. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-306-0377.

Angela A. Armstrong
Examiner
Art Unit 2654

AAA
November 16, 2003


RICHEMOND DORVIL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER